

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 UNDER 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) based on *Konishi et al.* Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants have amended claim 1 basically simply to clarify the intent of original claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite that all the plurality of tape pull-out members mounted on the sub chassis represent all of the tape pull-out members included in the magnetic recording and reproduction apparatus acting to pull out the tape. As is described in the present application at page 8, lines 26-27, for example, all the tape pull-out members 2, 6, 9 and 10 are provided on the sub chassis 1.

The present application describes how a configuration in which all the tape pull-out members 2, 6, 9 and 10 are provided on the sub chassis 1 is advantageous. For example, such an arrangement significantly simplifies the tape pull-out mechanism. This leads to reduction of the number of required components, weight and size reduction, simplification of the structure, and improvement of the quality of the tape pull-out mechanism and also the magnetic recording and reproduction apparatus. (See, e.g., Spec., p. 20, Ins. 12-23).

In rejecting claims 1-5, the Examiner states that *Konishi et al.* teaches a magnetic recording and reproduction apparatus in which all of the plurality of tape pull-out members are mounted on the sub chassis. Specifically, the Examiner refers to column 11, line 32 through column 12, line 67.

Applicants note that in *Konishi et al.*, tension post 14, boat 39, boat 40 and tension post 30 are analogous to the tape pull-out members 2, 6, 9 and 10 described in relation to the present invention. In addition, *Konishi et al.* admittedly teaches that the tension posts 14 and 30 are mounted on the sub chassis. (See, e.g., Col. 5, Ins. 56-59 and Col. 6, Ins. 29-31).

On the other hand, applicants respectfully submit that *Konishi et al.* teaches that the boats 39 and 40 are mounted on the main chassis. *Konishi et al.* teaches that the boats 39 and 40 are not mounted on the sub chassis with tension posts 14 and 30. Thus, *Konishi et al.* does not teach or suggest all of the tape pull-out members being mounted on the sub chassis as recited in claim 1.

For example, Fig. 3 of *Konishi et al.* represents the magnetic recording/reproduction apparatus of *Konishi et al.* with the sub chassis removed. (See, e.g., Col. 2, Ins. 62-64). However, Fig. 3 shows how the boats 39 and 40 remain present even though the sub chassis has been removed. Accordingly, the boats 39 and 40 in *Konishi et al.*, representing tape pull-out members, clearly are not mounted on the sub chassis as recited in claim 1. Rather, the boats 39 and 40 are mounted on the main chassis (which is specifically what the present invention seeks to avoid).

This fact is further evidenced by the written description in *Konishi et al.* Specifically, *Konishi et al.* expressly states how the boats 39 and 40 are provided on the main chassis, and not on the sub chassis as recited in claim 1. (See, e.g., Col. 7, Ins. 39-40).

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that *Konishi et al.* does not teach or suggest a magnetic recording and reproduction apparatus in which all of the tape pull-out members are mounted on the sub chassis as recited in claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-5 which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-5 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/
Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: October 6, 2006

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
yamap909amendmentnonfinal1.wpd